UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
55th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 10 March 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DINU (Romania)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 153: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN MOZAMBIQUE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 117: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS ANGOLA VERIFICATION MISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 121: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS MISSION FOR THE REFERENDUM IN WESTERN SAHARA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 119: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER GROUP IN CENTRAL AMERICA (continued)*

AGENDA ITEM 122: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION IN EL SALVADOR (continued)*

AGENDA ITEM 147: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991 (continued)

Final appropriations for 1990-1991 (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* Items considered together.

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.55
5 August 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-80268 6656S (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m

AGENDA ITEM 153: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN MOZAMBIQUE (continued) (A/47/881/Add.1 and A/47/896; A/C.5/47/L.32)

1. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.32, said that it was patterned in general on the usual format for draft resolutions on peace-keeping operations. The draft resolution, in paragraph 5, requested the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council by 31 March 1993, and, in paragraph 6, would have the General Assembly appropriate a lump sum of $140 million, inclusive of an amount of $9.5 million authorized with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee for the period 15 October 1992 to 30 June 1993. The apportionment of that amount among Member States was detailed in paragraph 7. Paragraphs 8 and 9 related to the contributions of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. In paragraph 10 the Secretary-General was requested to submit revised estimates for the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) by 1 July 1993.

2. Part B of the draft resolution raised a number of general concerns in connection with peace-keeping operations relating to the need for the effective planning and timely launching of such missions in a cost-effective manner. She trusted that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.32 without a vote.

4. It was so decided.

5. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, but had some concern regarding the administration and budgetary planning of ONUMOZ and of other peace-keeping operations. Specifically, the General Assembly had called on the Secretary-General and the Board of Auditors to provide for more extensive external auditing of peace-keeping operations, but the opposite seemed to be happening. For example, in connection with an amount of $36 million relating to El Salvador in 1992, $12,000 had been appropriated for external auditing. In the case of ONUMOZ, involving some $250 million, a mere $15,000 was earmarked for external auditing. He trusted that appropriations in respect of future peace-keeping operations would include adequate provision for external auditing.

6. Mr. SALES (Mozambique) said that his delegation welcomed the prompt action taken on the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 117: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS ANGOLA VERIFICATION MISSION (continued) (A/47/744)

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the General Assembly, in its decision 47/450, had authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments up to the amount of $25,258,800 gross for the maintenance of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) for the period ending 28 February 1993. Given the change in the operational plan of UNAVEM II and the need for the Secretariat to revise the Secretary-General's report on the financing of UNAVEM (A/47/744), the Committee was not in a position to act, pending submission of the Secretary-General's revised report and the related report of the Advisory Committee.

8. In order to provide for the continued maintenance of UNAVEM II, he proposed that a commitment authorization in an amount not exceeding $3.5 million gross ($3.4 million net) per month for the period from 1 March 1993 should be provided, subject to the concurrence of the Advisory Committee. The amount concurred in by the Advisory Committee should be assessed on member States in accordance with the scheme set out in the draft resolution on ONUMOZ that the Committee had just recommended for adoption by the General Assembly.

9. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that the Committee, which on occasion devoted a considerable amount of time to considering modest appropriations, was now proposing to authorize an amount of some $3.5 million per month in short order. His delegation, for one, had not been aware of the amount before the meeting, and needed time to reflect. A related issue was when the Secretary-General intended to issue assessment letters, and how that could mesh with national budget cycles. He had no desire to hinder the Committee in its work, but time was clearly available, given which a decision should be deferred.

10. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) said that it appeared that the Committee had little alternative to the course proposed by the Chairman, but his delegation was concerned by the way in which the Committee was proceeding. The need to issue revised estimates within an uncertain time-frame inevitably caused delay. He hoped that the Secretariat would inform the Committee when it expected to issue the revised budgetary proposal, an element which should be included in any decision taken by the Committee.

11. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that it appeared that the Committee was being asked to sign a blank cheque with an assurance that a budget for the operation would be provided later. That was not a satisfactory approach. His delegation wanted to know how the amount stated by the Chairman had been determined and when revised estimates would be made available. Perhaps it would be possible to extend financing of the operation for one month to give sufficient time to prepare the revised estimates, but he could not support open-ended funding without a precise indication of what was actually needed.

12. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said that the Committee should allow the Secretariat time to produce the information required.

13. Mr. BAUDOT (Controller) said that expenditure up to the end of February was currently authorized, and that the Committee was now being asked to give an authorization for expenditure of up to $3.5 million per month to maintain the operation until the Security Council took a decision on UNAVEM II. The request that was being submitted - subject to the concurrence of the Advisory Committee - was not a blank cheque, but temporary funding pending a political decision.

14. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Security Council, in its resolution 804 (1993), had decided to extend the mandate of UNAVEM II until 30 April 1993. The Security Council had also approved the Secretary-General proposals in document S/25140 to scale down UNAVEM II. The related preliminary estimates had been presented in document S/25140/Add.1. The Advisory Committee was now awaiting an updated report from the Secretary-General. The Committee had yet to discuss the estimates relating to the scaled-down Mission; there was no expenditure authorization for the period ending 30 April 1993, to which date the mandate of UNAVEM II had been extended by the Security Council.

15. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) said that it was not at all clear what procedure the Committee was intending to follow. His delegation, and probably others, would need to seek instructions before it could accede to the Chairman's suggestion. Perhaps another course of action could be found.

16. Mr. FRANCIS (Australia) said that his delegation would welcome an indication from the Secretariat of how they proposed to fund the loans to the UNAVEM II account from the Peace-keeping Reserve Fund, since they represented a sizeable sum.

17. Mr. BAUDOT (Controller) said that the commitment authority the Secretary-General was seeking from the General Assembly, subject to the concurrence of the Advisory Committee, would cover the period 1 March 1993 to 30 April 1993. The question asked by the representative of Australia related not just to the UNAVEM II operation but to others as well. He would therefore prefer to address the question in the context of the report on the establishment of the Peace-keeping Reserve Fund which had been submitted to the Fifth Committee.

18. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) asked whether the Secretariat intended to update document A/47/744 before or after 30 April 1993.

19. Mr. BAUDOT (Controller) said that the Secretariat hoped to present a report on the financing of the operation before the end of April.

20. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) stressed that the amount requested was quite large. Since his Government would bear a larger share than many others and his

(Mr. Inomata, Japan)

Government's accounts closed at the end of March, it was important to know the exact amount to be recommended by the Advisory Committee and when the letters of assessment would be sent to Governments. Unless the Secretariat could substantiate the figure of $3.5 million per month his delegation might have a hard time persuading the Government authorities to accept it. The problem with the course of action being suggested was that the Committee had no basis on which to take a decision. It was not known for instance, how much of the amount would actually be used. Had the proposal been put forward a few days previously and arrangements been made to brief delegations on the current status of the accounts for UNAVEM II and the status of contributions, States would have been in a position to determine the share they would be expected to bear. The Committee should revert to the matter later when it had more information.

21. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the query of the representative of Canada as to what option had been selected for UNAVEM II, said that three options had been specified in paragraph 30 of the Secretary-General's report (S/25140) and that the Security Council had endorsed option C, which entailed the concentration of UNAVEM II in Luanda. In his report on financial implications (S/25140/Add.1), option C had been costed at $940,000 a month, while Options A and B had been costed at $4,720,000 a month and $1,930,000 a month respectively.

22. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that on the basis of the information provided previously by the Secretariat and by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, his delegation had been willing to go along with a two-month extension at the proposed level of $3.5 million a month, but in view of the additional information provided by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, that amount now appeared to be in excess of what would be necessary to implement option C. Additional information was needed so that the Committee could have a more precise idea of what it was being asked to approve.

23. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) said that in the light of the Security Council's recommendation, his delegation had expected requirements for UNAVEM II to be on the order of $900,000 a month. His delegation was, therefore, dismayed that a much larger amount was now being requested. The Canadian Government would be reluctant to provide additional funds without any solid justification, especially in a period of serious financial constraints.

24. Mr. BAUDOT (Controller) said that the Secretariat would appreciate more time to provide the additional information requested by delegations.

AGENDA ITEM 121: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS MISSION FOR THE REFERENDUM IN WESTERN SAHARA (continued)

25. The CHAIRMAN recalled that by decision 47/451 the General Assembly had authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments up to the amount of

(The Chairman)

$7,138,500 gross ($6,834,300 net) for the maintenance of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) for the period ending 28 February 1993; had decided to provide that amount from the unencumbered balance of the appropriation provided for the Mission; and had deferred to the resumed forty-seventh session of the Assembly consideration of agenda item 121.

26. In the light of a recent decision by the Security Council concerning the implementation of the settlement plan regarding Western Sahara, the Committee was not in a position to consider the report of the Secretary-General (A/47/743). The matter could be taken up during the informal meetings planned for the following days.

AGENDA ITEM 119: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER GROUP IN CENTRAL AMERICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 122: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION IN EL SALVADOR (continued) (A/47/556, A/47/751 and A/47/900)

27. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided to consider items 119 and 122 together and that the General Assembly had, by decision 47/452, authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments up to the amount of $8,045,600 gross ($7,514,200 net) for the maintenance of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL) for the period ending 28 February 1993 and had deferred to the resumed forty-seventh session of the Assembly consideration of agenda item 122.

28. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that by resolution 791 (1992) the Security Council had extended the mandate of ONUSAL for a further period of six months ending on 31 May 1993. The Secretary-General had submitted estimates of $19,339,500 gross ($17,999,700 net) for ONUSAL in document A/47/751. The estimates had provided, inter alia, for 313 civilian personnel and 234 military personnel. As a result of the late submission of the report, the consideration of the estimates by the General Assembly had been postponed to a resumed session in the first quarter of 1992. In the meantime, an amount of $8,045,600 gross ($7,514,200 net) had been appropriated and assessed for the period ending 28 February 1993. In paragraph 83 of his report to the Security Council (S/24833), the Secretary-General indicated that the personnel requirements for the election process would be phased in as required and that it was anticipated that ONUSAL would complete its mission by mid-1994. The related report of ACABQ was contained in document A/47/900.

29. In considering the ONUSAL estimates, the Advisory Committee had taken into account the fact that the Security Council had terminated the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) effective 17 January 1992. However, appropriations for ONUCA had been approved and assessed for the period ending 30 April 1992. The Committee had been informed that $4.7 million gross ($4.6 million net) constituted an amount assessed on Member States for which there was no valid mandate.

(Mr. Mselle)

30. The ONUCA and ONUSAL accounts had been merged and the combined account reflected miscellaneous and interest income amounting to $4.6 million. There was also a large unencumbered balance of about $17.5 million in addition to $1.8 million representing the value of ONUCA-owned equipment in the United Nations Supply Depot.

31. The Advisory Committee had indicated a number of areas where the expenditure might not be fully needed as estimated by the Secretariat. Taking all those factors together, the Committee had recommended that an amount of $17.2 million gross ($16 million net) should be appropriated by the General Assembly for the period ending 31 May 1993.

32. For the reasons stated in paragraph 40 of its report, miscellaneous and interest income of $4.6 million would be credited to Member States. Taking into account the fact that $8,045,600 gross had already been appropriated and assessed on Member States, the Committee recommended an additional assessment of $4.6 million gross ($3.9 million net). For the period after 31 May 1993, the Committee recommended $2.9 million gross or $2.7 million net in commitment authority to the Secretary-General with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. In view of the large amounts remaining to be collected from Member States, the Advisory Committee urged the Secretary-General to pursue his efforts to collect outstanding assessments for ONUCA and ONUSAL. As stated in paragraph 33 of its report, the Advisory Committee would take into account the outstanding assessments and the amount of $4.6 million assessed on Member States for ONUCA beyond 17 January 1992 before the Committee decided whether or not to authorize an additional assessment on Member States for the period after 31 May 1993.

33. Ms. RIGGELSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its States members, said that the European Community could support the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the General Assembly should appropriate an amount of $17.2 million gross ($16 million net) for ONUSAL for the period 1 December 1992 to 31 May 1993. With regard to the period after 31 May 1993, the European Community could support the recommendation that the Secretary-General should be given commitment authority in the amount of $2.9 million gross ($2.7 million net) per month for the period of the extension subject to the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee, should the Security Council extend the mandate of ONUSAL.

34. In that context, States members of the European Community especially welcomed the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the combined miscellaneous and interest income of $4.6 million should be credited to Member States against future assessments for ONUSAL. She reiterated the European Community's concern about the practice of retaining unencumbered balances and lamented the fact that it had not been discontinued. It was to be hoped that that situation would be rectified in the budget for the period after 31 May 1993 should the Security Council decide to extend the mandate of

(Ms. Riggelsen, Denmark)

ONUSAL. Another point of principle which the European Community and its States members would like to see addressed regarding the future financing of the ONUCA/ONUSAL account was the question of the excess amount assessed for ONUCA, i.e., that part of the assessment relating to the month following the Security Council's decision to shorten the ONUCA mandate.

35. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) said that following the merger of the ONUCA and ONUSAL accounts, the credits to Member States that had already paid their full assessments for ONUCA should be offset against their assessments for ONUSAL. While his delegation was willing to agree that miscellaneous income of $4.6 million should be credited to the Members as a whole, it felt that those Members which had overpaid their assessments for ONUCA should receive a reduction in their share of the proposed amount of $3.9 million which remained to be assessed for ONUSAL.

36. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) referring to annex VI of document A/47/556 on ONUCA asked what the current unencumbered balance for that particular operation was. The figure of $12.9 million seemed more relevant than the unutilized balance of $4.7 million mentioned in the Advisory Committee's report (A/47/900, para. 30), since the former figure related to the entire length of the operation. Similarly, he wondered whether there had been any change in the amount of outstanding contributions to ONUCA ($12.7 million). An amount was outstanding of $3.7 million from the United States owing to the fact that his Government had been billed for ONUCA after the operation had been terminated by the Security Council and the fact that the Government had decided to use the limited funds available to it for peace-keeping to the two new operations launched in 1992 in Cambodia and Yugoslavia. He asked the Secretariat to explain why the voluntary contribution in kind valued at $1,563,000 had been shown as both income and expenditure especially since it appeared not to have any impact on the amount assessed on all Member States.

37. Turning to ONUSAL, he said that his delegation would appreciate having more time to examine the Advisory Committee's report in detail since at the past two sessions of the General Assembly, reports on ONUSAL had been submitted so late that it had been virtually impossible to give them the attention they deserved. Given the findings of the Advisory Committee, it was not surprising that the Secretariat had held off submitting its peace-keeping budgets until late in the session when few delegations would have had the opportunity to read the reports. His delegation hoped that the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee could revise the timetable for submission and consideration of the peace-keeping budgets and reports in order to give Member States more time to study the proposals and recommendations.

38. The Advisory Committee's report mentioned not only waste but also the Secretariat's disregard for many of the cost-saving measures that had been recommended in the past by ACABQ and approved by the General Assembly. In the United States, government officials who so wilfully failed to implement

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

legislative decisions would be jailed, dismissed or, at the very least, reprimanded. In the discussion of a code of conduct for United Nations staff, provisions should perhaps be considered for penalizing those Secretariat officials who failed to implement decisions of the General Assembly.

39. He would be grateful if the Chairman of ACABQ could inform the Fifth Committee what action the Advisory Committee could take to compel compliance and why it had not taken a more aggressive approach to the problem in the past. For example, in paragraph 15 of its report (A/47/900), the Advisory Committee stated that the Secretariat had failed to revise subsistence allowance rates for mission staff, despite the former's recommendation on the matter. Allowances throughout the system were generally much too high and his delegation would consider introducing a proposal, under another agenda item, to reduce them. He also noted the observation of ACABQ that remuneration levels for local staff were high in comparison with the average local salary scale. His delegation shared that view and intended to have the matter resolved under the appropriate agenda item.

40. In paragraph 19 of its report, ACABQ noted that excesses in budgeting for legal assistance and public information campaigns continued, despite its previous recommendations. It was disappointing to read that all the Advisory Committee could do was to reiterate its request that the Secretary-General should achieve maximum economy, which was obviously a meaningless appeal.

41. In paragraph 21, the Advisory Committee noted that the Organization continued to rent at considerable cost buildings and parking space for the peace-keeping operation. He wished to know what, if anything, the Government had contributed to the operation. That was not the only case in which a host Government had not met its obligations under the status-of-forces agreement for peace-keeping operations (A/45/594) and he wondered what the Secretariat was doing about the matter other than passing on unnecessary costs to all Member States.

42. His delegation was disappointed that, despite those serious problems, ACABQ could recommend only a reduction of about 10 per cent in the monthly commitment authority.

43. On the question of the merging of the accounts of ONUCA and ONUSAL, the General Assembly had agreed in principle to the merging but had not had an opportunity to discuss its modalities. The General Assembly's resolution on the operation must therefore include provisions to accomplish that objective.

44. His delegation wished to suggest, firstly, that the General Assembly should revise the appropriation for ONUCA to bring expenditure into line with income, thereby eliminating the unencumbered balance reported by the Secretary-General.

45. Secondly, the assessments of Member States should be adjusted to reflect the lower level of expenditures, as had been done in the case of UNTAG. Such

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

an adjustment would reduce arrears for some Member States and result in reimbursements for those States which had paid their contributions in full.

46. Thirdly, the credits and debits on the ONUCA account should be carried over in the ONUSAL account. Payments received from Member States in arrears would be credited in the first instance against ONUCA arrears. Such an arrangement would ensure that a higher percentage of outstanding assessments to ONUCA was collected and that those Member States which had fully met their obligations were not penalized.

47. Mr. DAMICO (Brazil) said that his delegation shared the concerns expressed by ACABQ, particularly those raised in paragraphs 23 to 28 of its report (A/47/900). The administration of peace-keeping operations, in which a delicate balance had to be maintained between the discharge of the mandate and the cost-effectiveness of the operation, was no easy task. Indeed, short-term economies might jeopardize the implementation of mandates and generate additional expenditures in the future. In that connection, the possible understaffing of different components of the peace-keeping operation was a matter of some concern, particularly since ONUSAL was committed to the creation of a national police force in El Salvador, a task that required the deployment of a large number of civilian police monitors.

48. His delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, on the understanding that the amounts proposed for assessment would not result in keeping the staff level below what was required for the effective discharge of the mandate of ONUSAL.

49. Mr. FRANCIS (Australia), referring to the matter of unencumbered balances, said that the method used for dealing with the item in the Secretary-General's report (A/47/751) was inappropriate and differed from the practice followed for earlier accounts, such as that of UNTAG.

50. In his view, those countries that had paid in full should be credited and the credits posted to the combined accounts, while those that were in arrears should have their debits transferred to the combined accounts.

51. Furthermore, it was not clear from the report what the amount of the unencumbered balance was. His Government would prefer to see a credit in the combined account against future assessments and his delegation therefore favoured further discussion of the matter in informal sessions in order to clarify the approach being put forward.

52. Mr. INOMATA (Japan), referring to the questions of the unencumbered balance and the operating deficit in the report of the Secretary-General (A/47/751), shared the view of the representative of Australia that the definition of unencumbered balance differed from previous definitions of the concept. The definition of terms dictated the outcome of discussions and the

(Mr. Inomata, Japan)

Fifth Committee, in particular, must be careful not to change the definition of accounting terms.

53. The concept of operating deficit, for its part, was based on the existence of outstanding assessments. It was obvious that the Secretariat would propose, in every case, that any unencumbered balance should be retained. The Fifth Committee had agreed on the need for a peace-keeping reserve fund to assist in start-up operations. Even after operations were in place, however, they continued to rely on the reserve fund, pending the payment of assessed contributions. The Secretariat should therefore review its policy of funding peace-keeping operations in light of the establishment of the peace-keeping reserve fund and should put an end to the practice of retaining unencumbered balances on the ground that assessed contributions were still outstanding. In that connection, his delegation supported the views expressed by the European Economic Community on the matter.

54. With respect to the use of the peace-keeping reserve fund, the Secretary-General had reported that ONUSAL had borrowed the amount of $5 million from the peace-keeping reserve fund, while the report of ACABQ stated that only $2 million had been used to fill an operating deficit. He wondered what were the reasons for that discrepancy and hoped that the Secretary-General would seek to improve the method of disposing of the unencumbered balance and reduce the need for recourse to the peace-keeping reserve fund.

55. Mr. HOSANG (Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance), replying to questions raised by the United States delegation and touched upon by the delegation of Australia said that the Secretariat had provided additional information to the Advisory Committee which showed that, as at 31 December 1992, the unencumbered balance for ONUCA was $12,910,046, which represented an increase of $25,223 over the figure shown in annex V of document A/47/751.

56. On the question of outstanding assessments, at the end of February 1993, total assessments for ONUCA were $12,640,000, which meant that approximately $97,500 had been collected for ONUCA, thereby increasing the unutilized balance to approximately $250,000.

57. With respect to voluntary contributions under income, it had been pointed out that the same amount had been shown under expenditure. In that connection, the General Assembly had decided that whenever a budgeted item was contributed in kind, the appropriation would be decreased by the amount budgeted. The resources available to ONUCA had thus been increased by the addition of voluntary contributions in kind. Those resources were also shown as expenditure in accordance with the policy laid down by the General Assembly.

58. Mr. FRANCIS (Australia) requested that the list of questions to be answered by the Secretariat should include the question which he had asked

(Mr. Francis, Australia)

earlier, namely, why had the unencumbered balance for ONUCA been handled differently from the practice followed in other operations.

AGENDA ITEM 147: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991 (continued)

Final appropriations for 1990-1991 (continued) (A/C.5/47/77)

59. The CHAIRMAN recalled that in its decision 47/453 of 22 December 1992, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, had decided to accept the recommendation of ACABQ with regard to unliquidated obligations, and to revert to the question of the final appropriations for the biennium 1990-1991 at its resumed forty-seventh session.

60. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said that an analysis of document A/C.5/46/46/Add.1 raised a number of questions with regard to the Secretariat's policy and practice in the matter of supernumeraries who, according to information provided by the Secretariat, were staff members not occupying posts. In at least 15 out of the 32 expenditure sections in the programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991 (A/C.5/46/46/Add.1), supernumeraries were attached to units at a total cost for the biennium of at least $9.5 million. The question of posts was a key issue in the General Assembly's decisions on new budgets. Where additional mandates were given, programme budget implications were provided and decisions on resources taken by the General Assembly. It would appear that supernumeraries were created by the Secretariat without the involvement of the General Assembly. That trend had consequences for the 1992-1993 budget, including the revised estimates. He would therefore be grateful if the Secretariat could provide clear answers, in writing, to a number of questions prior to consideration of the issue at the following resumed session.

61. He would welcome, first of all, an update of the information contained in document A/C.5/46/46/Add.1, including details of the list of posts, ranks of the incumbents, cost per post, and breakdown of incumbents by gender. He wished to know, furthermore, how many of the incumbents were retired or dismissed United Nations officials, and whether any had been employed as consultants before or after becoming supernumeraries.

62. Secondly, he wished to know the basis on which supernumeraries were recruited, since the staff rules contained no mention of them. If they were recruited for mandated activities, why were they not included in the programme budget implications and proposed for inclusion in the 1990-1991 budget when the latter was submitted or revised? If supernumeraries were involved in mandated activities, to whom were they answerable and by whom were they supervised? Did they supervise staff involved in mandated activities? If they were not recruited for mandated activities, then why were they recruited? What was the relationship between the work performed by supernumeraries and the activities of temporary assistants and consultants? Who determined hiring and why was provision made for separation costs for supernumeraries? What guidelines were applicable to them and could those guidelines be made available to the Fifth Committee?

(Mr. Spaans, Netherlands)

63. He also wished to know whether the Advisory Committee was kept informed of the practice and, if so, how.

64. With regard to the performance reports and revised estimates, he wondered why there had been no mention of supernumeraries in the first performance report. He would also welcome clarification of the Secretariat's statement that the availability of a large core of permanent staff enabled the Secretariat in New York to cope with sudden or expected changes in the calendar, in a body's meeting, or in documentation requirements, without significant additional cost. A number of supernumeraries appeared to be involved in precisely such activities.

65. He wished to know, further, how many supernumeraries had been continued in the 1992-1993 budget as well as their breakdown according to section, rank, cost, and gender. Why had they been continued, if indeed any had been? Had the same positions within sections been continued by other persons, and if so, why? He noted the omission of any reference to supernumeraries in a number of documents, including the first performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 (A/C.5/47/47). Were there any supernumeraries at the time of drafting or submission of the first report, and if so, why was there no mention of it. He also wondered whether there were any supernumeraries attached to the units or functions that were subject to restructuring or revised estimates, and if so, how many there were.

66. He wished to know, in conclusion, whether the practice still applied and whether the Secretariat proposed to continue its application in future.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

67. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the second revision of the programme of work for the current week and the tentative programme of work for the second part of the resumed session. The programme of work for 25 March to 2 April 1993 took account of the availability of the Secretary-General's report on the revised estimates. The English version of that document had been available to delegations since 5 March 1993, and the document would be issued in all languages on 12 March. The Bureau therefore suggested that the document should be introduced on 25 March. On 29 March, the Committee would have before it the report of ACABQ on the revised estimates.

68. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) proposed that the Committee should postpone its consideration of the programme of work for the second part of the resumed session until it had heard the briefing by the Special Adviser and Delegate of the Secretary-General on the revised estimates, which was to be held on Thursday afternoon, 11 March. By that time, the Advisory Committee might be able to inform the Committee when it would issue its report on the revised estimates.

69. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that he was convinced that the tentative programme of work for the second part of the resumed forty-seventh session reflected the consensus of the Committee. While the Committee should remain flexible in implementing the proposed programme of work, it should not have to adjust its programme in order to accommodate a subsidiary body, since subsidiary bodies should not dictate the work of Main Committees.

70. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said that his delegation supported the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom. His delegation would not be in a position to consider the tentative programme of work for the second part of the resumed session until it had sufficient time to study the revised estimates.

71. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the Committee would need more time to consider the programme of work for the second part of its resumed session, and he proposed that the Committee should mandate the Chairman to consult with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, and also with representatives of the Bureau, in order to enable the Chairman of the Committee to present a proposal on the programme of work that did not set one body against another.

72. Mr. SENGWE (Zimbabwe) said that the question of the revised estimates was very important, and the Committee should not consider the item without the benefit of the ACABQ report on the subject.

73. Mr. FONTAINE (Cuba) supported the statement made by the representative of Ghana. Since the Secretary-General's report on the revised budget estimates contained financial implications, it would have to be considered in conjunction with the ACABQ report. His delegation was willing to accept any dates for the consideration of the revised estimates, provided that the Committee had before it all the relevant documents.

74. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Hungary) said that the Committee should begin its consideration of the revised estimates no later than 29 March even if the Advisory Committee had not completed its report on the revised estimates. Perhaps the Advisory Committee could submit a number of partial reports on the revised estimates in order to facilitate the Committee's consideration of the matter.

75. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the Secretariat should indicate whether there would be any problems if the Committee took a decision on the revised estimates after 2 April 1993. The Committee might be able to meet the 2 April deadline if the Advisory Committee speeded up its work.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.